



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/694,314	10/27/2003	Edgar Hoppe	070255.0630	3551
31625	7590	08/20/2008	EXAMINER	
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. PATENT DEPARTMENT 98 SAN JACINTO BLVD., SUITE 1500 AUSTIN, TX 78701-4039			NGUYEN BA, HOANG VU A	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2623		
		MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE
		08/20/2008		PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/694,314	HOPPE ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Hoang-Vu A. Nguyen-Ba	2623	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 28 May 2008.
 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
 3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
 Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
 5) Notice of Informal Patent Application
 6) Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Continued Examination Under 37 CFR 1.114

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on May 28, 2008 has been entered.

2. Claims 1-33 remain pending. Claims 1, 16, 17 and 19 are independent claims.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicants' arguments in the Remarks filed on April 4, 2008 have been fully considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Specification

4. The specification is objected to because of the following minor informalities:

The title of the invention is not descriptive. A new title is required that is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 1-5 and 7-18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,934 to Buchsbaum.

Claim 1

Newnam discloses at least *a method for information exchange, comprising the steps of: producing information transmissions in a broadcast standard* (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8);
sending the information transmissions live from a studio (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8).

Newnam does not specifically disclose:

receiving the information transmission by a TV decoder and feeding them into a data and/or communications network.

However, in an analogous art, Billmaier teaches a Media Center Extension (MCX) that can be integrated within a set top box (STB) and receives broadcast information from the broadband network 103 and transmits the received processed information to a television or PC via the home network 406 (see at least FIG. 5, device 404; [0053-0057]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the system taught by Billmaier in that of Newnam because the system of Billmaier applied in Newnam would greatly improve the interactive capability of the Newnam system.

The combination Newnam-Billmaier further discloses:

installing software on a data processing equipment, like PCs or workplace computers, in which the software, after the data processing device has been connected to the data and/or communications network, permits receiving of the information transmissions and use of at least part of the functions furnished by the information transmission (see at least [0041]; [0032]);

accessing the information transmission via a portal (see at least [0029]);

and

using the functions furnished by the information transmission via communications connections between the data processing equipment and studio for an interactive information exchange (see at least [0029-0033]; [0035-0036]).

The combination Newnam-Billmaier does not specifically disclose:

digitizing the sent information transmissions and then transmitting the digitized informations via satellite as IP multicast packets.

However, in an analogous art, Buchsbaum discloses that content which includes multicast file transfer software can be transmitted in a broadcast mode from a source to multiple destinations over satellite link (see at least 1:49-59).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to combine the satellite-based content distribution method using IP multicast technology as described in Buchsbaum with the combined system of Newnam-Billmaier, as the combination of Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum would allow a production studio to insert digital information into TV programming data stream and to transmit the combined information to the receiving end via satellite.

Claim 2

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum further discloses *wherein access to an information transmission and/or use of the functions provided by the information transmission occurs as a function of access authorization* (Newnam; see at least [0029]; accessing WebTV using dial-up communication requires authentication).

Claim 3

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buchsbaum further discloses *wherein access to an information transmission occurs after access to the portal and call-up of a link for information transmission* (Newnam; see at least [0029]).

Claim 4

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 2 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum does not specifically disclose *wherein access authorizations are sent by email and/or an SMS method to a selected group of persons*. However, this feature is deemed inherent to Newnam's chat facilities (see at least FIG. 9) which require an apparent authorization process because in order to join a chatroom a user has to give his/her e-mail address. See also definition below:

Chat "is a bit like e-mail in real time. Users have conversations via the keyboard in "Chat rooms" with other users. Chat has been criticized for being addictive as well as concerns over unsuitable contact between children and adults. To join a chatroom you usually have to give your e-mail address and this can lead to spam.

www.smallbizonline.co.uk/glossary_of_internet_terms.php"

Thus, without sending request for participation and authorization by the other party, chat session cannot be conducted.

Claim 5

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the TV decoder, which feeds the received data into a local network, like a local area network (LAN) and/or an audio feedback channel from a data processing unit, like a PC or workplace computer, is coupled to the production studio of the information transmission via a virtual private network (VPN) separate from a satellite transmission channel* (Billmaier; see at least FIG. 5).

Claim 7

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein playback of the information transmission on the data*

processing equipment, like PCs or workplace computers, occurs with one or more Web browsers (Newnam; see at least [0041]).

Claim 8

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein, for playback of information transmissions in a Web browser, several windows, like a window for live presentation of a moderator or teacher in the studio (film window) or a window for presentation of graphics and/or tests (graphics window), are provided* (Newnam; see at least [0041]; FIG. 9; claim 12; [0037]).

Claim 9

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 8 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the windows provided for playback of information transmissions in a Web browser are sent in full screen representation* (Newnam; see at least FIG. 9).

Claim 10

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the software, after log-on at a portal, is installed by an initial applet on the data processing equipment or software installed on the data processing equipment is updated after log-on at the portal* (Newnam; see at least [0032]; [0041]).

Claim 11

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the functions provided by the information transmission include execution and/or evaluation of surveys, execution and/or evaluation of multiple choice tests (MCT), layout, connection and/or management of telephone connections, data transmission,*

especially text transmission, between the data processing equipment and production studio and/or management (Newnam; see at least [0034-0036]; [0050]).

Claim 12

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 11 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum does not specifically disclose *wherein surveys and/or tests are designed as HTML-programmed files*. However, this feature is deemed inherent in the Newnam's questions and answers or real-time polls and trivia to be displayed on the end-user's screen. Without using the HTML, the end-user's screen does not know how to display the questions and answers or trivias. Furthermore if there are questions and answers that require linking to another location of the same document or to another document, HTML or derivatives of HTML must be used. Moreover, Newnam, in [0041], discloses that the base software can be incorporated in other software, such as in browser, one of the definitions of which is shown below:

[a] browser, or web browser, is the software used to view web pages and interact with various kinds of Internet resources. The browser interprets the HTML used to format web documents and recreates the page on your screen. There are a variety of web browsers available, the two most common being Microsoft's Internet Explorer and Netscape's Navigator.

www.liv.ac.uk/webteam/glossary/

Claim 13

The rejections of base claim 1 and intervening claim 11 are incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein a time limitation is stipulated for processing of surveys and/or tests and after this time elapses, the survey and/or test files are automatically closed for processing* (Newnma; see at least [0048]).

Claim 14

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein data and/or files, like text files, sent to the production studio and/or management are conveyed as email and/or as SMS messages to one or more designatable receivers* (Newnam; see at least [0035-0036]).

Claim15

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. The combination Newnam-Billmaier-Buschsbaum further discloses *wherein the method is carried out in a computer program which can be downloaded from an electronic data network, like the Internet, to a data processing unit connected to the data network* (Newnam; see at least [0041]).

Claim 16

Since Claim 16 is an independent claim that recites *an arrangement with at least one processor and/or chip setup so that a method for information exchange can be carried out, comprising* the same steps of the method recited in Claim 1, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 17

Since Claim 17 is an independent claim that recites *a computer program product stored on a computer readable storage medium for, when run on a computer, carrying out a method for information exchange, comprising* the same steps of the method recited in Claim 1, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 18

The rejection of base claim 17 is incorporated. Since Claim 18 recites the same features of Claim 15, the same rejection is thus applied.

7. Claims 19-23 and 25-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”).

Claim 19

Newnam discloses at least *a method for information exchange, comprising the steps of: producing information transmissions in a broadcast standard wherein the information transmissions include TV information and digital information* (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8); *sending the information transmissions live from a studio* (see at least [0007]; FIGs. 1-4, 6, 8).

Newnam does not specifically disclose:

receiving the information transmission by a TV decoder and feeding them into a data and/or communications network; *feeding the extracted video and digital information into a data processing equipment and connecting the data processing equipment to a data and/or communication network and accessing a main data processing equipment associated with the studio through the data and/or communication network.*

However, in an analogous art, Billmaier teaches a Media Center Extension (MCX) that can be integrated within a set top box (STB) and receives broadcast information from the broadband network 103 and transmits the received processed information to a television or PC via the home network 406 (see at least FIG. 5, device 404; [0053-0057]).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the system taught by Billmaier in that of Newnam because the system of Billmaier applied in Newnam would greatly improve the interactive capability of the Newnam system.

The combination Newnam-Billmaier further discloses:

extracting video information and digital information from the information transmissions (see at least FIG. 9, e.g., the video is extracted to be displayed in 410 and the digital is extracted to be displayed in 720 or 730 or 710);

decoding functions from the extracted digital information (see at least FIG. 9 and [0054]; in the case of the STB 110, the claimed “decoding functions” is interpreted as the adjustment of the placement of the interactive components based on the different type of the client device by the content display interface); *and*

using the functions furnished by the digital information via the established communications connection between the data processing equipment and the studio for an interactive information exchange (see at least [0029-0033]; [0035-0036]).

Claim 20

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 20 recites the same feature of Claim 2, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 21

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 21 recites the same feature of Claim 3, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 22

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 20 are incorporated. Since Claim 22 recites the same feature of Claim 4, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 23

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 23 recites the same feature of Claim 5, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 25

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 25 recites the same feature of Claim 7, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 26

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 26 recites the same feature of Claim 8, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 27

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 26 are incorporated. Since Claim 27 recites the same feature of Claim 9, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 28

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 28 recites the same feature of Claim 10, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 29

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 29 recites the same feature of Claim 11, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 30

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 29 are incorporated. Since Claim 30 recites the same feature of Claim 12, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 31

The rejections of base claim 19 and intervening claim 29 are incorporated. Since Claim 31 recites the same feature of Claim 13, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 32

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 32 recites the same feature of Claim 14, the same rejection is thus applied.

Claim 33

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 33 recites the same feature of Claim 15, the same rejection is thus applied.

8. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”) and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,161,934 to Buchsbaum..

Claim 6

The rejection of base claim 1 is incorporated. Newnam does not specifically disclose *wherein speech communication occurs as voiceover IP (VoIP) via an audio feedback channel*. However, the examiner takes Official Notice that

“[v]oice over Internet Protocol, also called VoIP, IP Telephony, Internet telephony, Broadband telephony, Broadband Phone and Voice over Broadband” which “is the routing of voice conversations over the Internet or through any other IP-based network” is old and well established in the art and that

“[c]ompanies providing VoIP service are commonly referred to as providers, and protocols which are used to carry voice signals over the IP network are commonly referred to as **Voice over IP** or **VoIP** protocols. They may be viewed as commercial realizations of the experimental Network Voice Protocol (1973) invented for the ARPANET providers” for the following purposes:

“[V]oIP is location independent, only an internet connection is needed to get a connection to a VoIP provider; for instance call center agents using VoIP phones can work from anywhere with a sufficiently fast and stable Internet connection.

VoIP phones can integrate with other services available over the Internet, including video conversation, message or data file exchange in parallel with the conversation, audio conferencing, managing address books and passing information about whether others (e.g. friends or colleagues) are available online to interested parties.”

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have included VoIP in Newnam because the skilled artisan would have recognized that the advantages of integrating VoIP with other services using IP protocol in Newnam would enhance the information exchange taught in Newnam.

9. Claim 24 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0133405 by Newnam et al. (“Newnam”) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,380,260 to Billmaier et al. (“Billmaier”).

Claim 24

The rejection of base claim 19 is incorporated. Since Claim 24 recites the same feature of Claim 6, the same rejection is thus applied.

Conclusion

10. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to Applicant’s disclosure.

11. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Hoang-Vu “Antony” Nguyen-Ba whose telephone number is (571) 272-3701. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday-Friday from 7:00 am to 5:30 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner are unsuccessful, the examiner’s supervisor, John Miller can be reached at (571) 272-7353.

The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (571) 273-8300.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the TC 2600 Group receptionist (571) 272-2600.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at (866) 217-9197 (toll-free).

/Hoang-Vu Antony Nguyen-Ba/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2623

August 15, 2008

Application/Control Number: 10/694,314
Art Unit: 2623

Page 15